



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_32702
Title of the Manuscript:	$\beta$ -sitosterol and its 3-O-glucosid as novel acaricides against Rhipicephalus (B.) annulatus ticks
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract:</b> I suggest to use 'Aim' not Aims To find ----- I suggest to mention the chemical name of CHCl<sub>3</sub>-chloroform and MeOH-methanol and give the chemical formula within brackets. Follow the same throughout the manuscript. Abstract line 23: glucosid recorded 76.66±5.57% and 98.33±2.88% <b>respectively</b>. Abstract last line rephrase: the n-hexane extract of M. forsskaolii, β-sitosterol and β-sitosterol-3-O-glucoside may be potentially used as safer alternatives in the control of tick populations. <b>Introduction:</b> Line 2: subtropical <b>areas</b>. Line 2: Provide the full name of tick Line 7: <b>safer</b> acaricides Page 2, Line 2: I suggest to use <b>Ravindran et al., 2012</b> but not Ravindran et al. 2012. Follow the same throughout the manuscript. Page 2, Line 3: ----- during the last <b>decade</b>, delete ten years. Page 2, Line 4: <b>Six crude extract of wild plant</b> ----- -. Section 2.2: delete 'of' <b>Section 2.3: The air-dried herb of M. forsskaolii (100 g) was successfully extracted with n-hexane -----.</b> Section 2.3, Line 2: Four concentrations were prepared for the four different extracts (1.25, 2.5, 5 and 10%) in</p>	<p>All required correction were done and highlighted except for <b>Section 2.3: The air-dried herb of M. forsskaolii (100 g) was successfully extracted with n-hexane -----.</b> Since I mean successively not <b>successfully</b> as solvents for fractionation were used one after another I couldn't understand the reviewer comment Section 2.3, <b>2<sup>nd</sup> Para</b></p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>50% DMSO-EtOH.  Section 2.3, Line 3: The <b>prepared</b> concentrations were applied on adult ticks and unfed larvae.  Section 2.3, <b>2<sup>nd</sup> Para</b>, Line 3: provide full form of pet.ether  Section 2.6, Line 1: remove the brackets in (Sharma et al. 2012)  Section 2.6, Line 2: ----- divided <b>into</b> six groups  Section 2.6, Line 3: The different groups of ticks were immersed in 10 ml of the different concentrations <b>of the extracts</b> -----.  Page 4, Section 2.6, line 1: ----- after 24 to 72 hours of <b>post</b> treatment (PT).   <b>References:</b>  Deshmane SS, Dev S. Higher Isoprenoids-II triterpenoids and steroids of <b><i>Saccharum officinarum</i></b>. Tetrahedron 1970; 27:1109–1118. I suggest italic the scientific names. Check the references for the same.</p>	<p><b>10 ml of each treatment</b></p> <p>scientific names are now italic</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The authors of this manuscript failed to insert line numbers. It becomes very difficult to point out corrections.</p>	<p>The submitted manuscript do contained the line numbers, it seems that the line numbers were deleted in editorial revision before peer review process.</p>